



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,086	02/26/2004	Hideobu Ito	1341.1192	3499
21171	7590	11/26/2008	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			YAARY, MICHAEL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/786,086

Applicant(s)

ITO ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL YAARY

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 and 6-12 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkubo et al. (hereafter Ohkubo)(US Pat. 6,212,677) in view of Lewallen (US Pat. 6,385,769).
4. Ohkubo was cited in the previous office action dated 03/20/2008.
5. **As to claims 1, 11, and 12**, Ohkubo discloses a computer program product including computer executable instructions stored on a computer readable medium, wherein the instructions, when executed by the computer, cause the computer to perform:

creating structure information that indicates a relation between a program call structure and data input-output information of the computer program source code by analyzing a computer program source code (*column 1, lines 54-59*);

Creating process-outline information of the computer program source code from a part of the structure information (*column 1, lines 59-60*);

Creating computer program specifications of the computer program source code by using the process-outline information (*column 1, lines 60-61*).

6. Ohkubo does not disclose extracting a comment that is added by a user to a predetermined position in the computer program specifications created; and Adding the comment extracted to a predetermined position in computer program specifications to be created.

However, Lewallen discloses extracting a comment that is added by a user to a predetermined position in the computer program specifications created; and adding the comment extracted to a predetermined position in computer program specifications to be created (*column 9, lines 12-23 and column 11, lines 4-8*).

7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Ohkubo by utilizing the comment

extracting, as taught in the software programming system of Lewallen, for the benefit of allowing for more flexibility in the construction and customizing of new beans created (Lewallen column 9, lines 43-48).

8. **As to claim 2**, the combination of Ohkubo and Lewallen disclose the creating of the process-outline information includes extracting information of a subroutine of a specific nesting level and data input-output information of the subroutine (Ohkubo, figure 4), and the creating of the computer program specifications includes using the information of the subroutine and the data input-output information of the subroutine (Ohkubo, *figure 7, control flow and heading of destination*).

9. **As to claim 3**, the combination of Ohkubo and Lewallen disclose the computer program product according to claim 2, wherein the computer program specifications created include a call structure diagram in a tabular form that has a plurality of columns assigned to respective nesting levels of subroutines, wherein a name of each subroutine is shown in a column corresponding to a nesting level of the each subroutine (Ohkubo, figure 5; figure 1 7 and 21).

10. **As to claim 4**, the combination of Ohkubo and Lewallen disclose the computer program product according to claim 1, wherein the creating of the structure information

includes creating structure information that indicates a relation between a program call structure and a program call condition (Ohkubo figure 7),

The creating of the process-outline information includes creating process-outline information that indicates a relation between a program call structure and a program call condition (Ohkubo figure 7), and

The creating of the computer program specifications includes creating computer program specifications that indicate a relation between a program call structure and a program call condition (Ohkubo, figure 7).

11. **As to claim 6**, the combination of Ohkubo and Lewallen disclose the computer program product according to claim 1, wherein the instructions further cause the computer to perform:

creating program-outline information of the computer program source code by summarizing statements included in the computer program source code (Ohkubo, figures 17 and 21);

creating a program-outline statement in a natural language from the program-outline information (Ohkubo, column 1, line 61); and

creating a program-outline document of the computer program source code by using the program-outline sentence (Ohkubo, column 1 line 61).

12. **As to claim 7**, the combination of Ohkubo and Lewallen disclose the computer program product according to claim 6, wherein the creating of the program-outline information includes

Determining a significance level of data included in the computer program source code (Ohkubo, *column 7, lines 54-67, "sec-error"*);

determining a significance level of a statement included in the computer program source code by using the significance level of data (Ohkubo, *column 7, lines 54-67, "sec-error", significant enough to be error*); and

Summarizing statements included in the computer program source code by using the significance level of the statement (Ohkubo, *column 7, lines 54-67, "sec-error"*).

13. **As to claim 8**, the combination of Ohkubo and Lewallen disclose the computer program product according to claim 1, wherein the instructions further cause the computer to perform:

Extracting input-output information of a job step included in a batch job from a batch-job script described in a batch-job script language (Ohkubo *column 1, lines 51-61; figure 2*);

Acquiring input information and output information of the overall batch job based on the input-output information of the job step (Ohkubo, *figure 2, S1*);

Specifying a job step at which the information acquired is input or output (Ohkubo, figure 2, S2);

Extracting information of a computer program called at the job step specified (Ohkubo, figure 2, S3-S7); and

Creating batch-job process-outline information of the batch job by using the input information specified, the output information specified, and the information of the computer program extracted (Ohkubo, figure 2, S8-S11).

14. **As to claim 9**, the combination of Ohkubo and Lewallen disclose the computer program product according to claim 1, wherein the instructions further cause the computer to perform:

Creating screen transition information by analyzing screen definitions which define information of a screen (Ohkubo, figure 2, "display;" figure 39); and

Creating a screen transition diagram by using the screen transition information (Ohkubo, figure 2, "display" figure 39).

15. **As to claim 10**, the combination of Ohkubo and Lewallen disclose the computer program product according to claim 9, wherein the screen definitions include information of transition between the screen and a computer program expressed in the computer program

source code, the screen transition information includes information of transition between the screen and the computer program (Ohkubo, figure 39), the instructions further cause the computer to perform:

Creating merge diagram information in which the transition and input-output of the computer program are merged, by merging the screen transition information with the structure information (Ohkubo, figure 39), wherein

The creating of the screen transition diagram includes creating a diagram in which the transition and the input-output of the computer program are merged, by using the merge diagram information (Ohkubo figure 39).

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 and 6-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL YAARY whose telephone number is (571)270-1249. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on (571) 272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. Y./
Examiner, Art Unit 2193

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193